

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 11:34:52 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #48
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 11 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 48

Today's Topics:

 2 Meter Toko Helical Filter
 Antenna recommendations needed
 CTCSS vs. DSQ: What's the difference?
 Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 10 January
 DJ-580 soft case (2 msgs)
 GRC-14 surplus
 intermod, overload, desense?
 License Delays
 Need recommendations for packet modems
 Yaesu 5100 reviews??
 Yaesu FT 5100 Reviews??

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 11 Jan 93 19:19:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 2 Meter Toko Helical Filter
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm looking for 3 other individuals interested in 2 meter Toko Helical
filters TK3506-ND. DigiKey sells them for \$23. @ (qty=1), however @ (qty=10)
the price is 1/2. This makes it attractive for a small group purchase;
2 for \$25 with \$1.25 left for postage.

DEAL: first three e-mail responses requesting 2 filters
 will get replies requesting \$25 checks >> NT1G

if there seems to be enough for single orders
I'll reply with the amount. (~\$14)

NO reply, sorry; will post results.

Order will be going in abt Thurs, no mailing
'til check arrives. (per individual)

73 de Skip,NT1G email 'flem%hydra@polaroid.com' me 508-872-8291

If you prefer to reply to my machine @ work 617-630-4482

ps. check out those nifty 12 and 25 Khz 10.7Mhz IF crystal filters
on the bottom the page 114. I can throw those in with the order, also.
(qty. 1 price)

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 15:51:25 GMT
From: shearson.com!jenny!mjohnsto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Antenna recommendations needed
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I've finally gotten the ok from my landlady to install a rooftop antenna on my house. (YIPPEE!) The antenna will be used for 2m/440 operation. I'm a complete newcomer to the field and am impatiently awaiting my tickets arrival and I need to do *SOMETHING* to take the edge off my anxiety. I want to put something up that will offer respectable performance without making the house look like a CIA substation. I'd like to spend no more than \$100 for a antenna that will accomplish this. (Not counting cable etc).

I've heard good things about the Ringo Ranger dual-band while listening to the local hams. My Elmer has recommended the Radio Shack Discone, which also reported makes a decent scanner antenna if used for that purpose.

Can you folks offer me some recommendations along these lines? Please email and I'll summarize.

Thanks and 73.

MJ

--

Michael R. Johnston, System Administrator mjohnsto@shearson.com
"The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man." - G.B. Shaw

Date: 11 Jan 93 16:28:58 GMT
From: shearson.com!jenny!mjohnsto@uunet.uu.net

Subject: CTCSS vs. DSQ: What's the difference?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm a little confused over the precise uses for the subaudible tones verses digital squelch. As I understand it:

- CTCSS Tones are generally used to access repeaters that use them.
- DSQ is used to open the squelch on radios that support it.

This seems pretty cut and dried. However, I noticed in my Alinco manual that it appears both could really be used for the same thing IE paging a specific ham or group of hams that have their radios properly configured, in addition to opening up a repeater that requires CTCSS tones or Touch-Tone access.

Since I don't have my ticket yet I haven't been able to do any experimenting or talking with local hams about the regional uses of this, so I must ask the net-at-large: Which of these is the more commonly accepted method of paging another ham? Do people actually use it frequently or is it too new to have widespread usage?

One last question. While listening to the local repeaters this weekend, I noticed that occasionally a ham would break into a conversation to 'make a call'. Generally they'd give their call sign and that of the person they were trying to call. They'd do this twice if the person didn't answer the first time. Now, I know the other ham could be just listening to his radio and waiting for someone to shout his call, but it seems to me that this would be an ideal use for CTCSS tones IE his squelch opens and he can then hear his buddy calling.

Since I can't hear the tones (by definition they're subaudible) I have no way of knowing whether they're using it or not. Is this common or are people just spending their entire days listening to repeaters, or are they using CTCSS tones?

Thanks and 73

--

Michael R. Johnston, System Administrator mjohnsto@shearson.com
"The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man." - G.B. Shaw

Date: 11 Jan 93 17:53:06 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 10 January
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 010, 01/10/93
10.7 FLUX=132 90-AVG=140 SSN=142 BKI=2464 3421 BAI=024
BGND-XRAY=B2.7 FLU1=1.6E+07 FLU10=1.0E+04 PKI=2475 4311 PAI=028
BOU-DEV=012,056,170,053,028,042,018,007 DEV-AVG=048 NT SWF=00:000
XRAY-MAX= C6.3 @ 1337UT XRAY-MIN= B2.2 @ 0305UT XRAY-AVG= B4.5
NEUTN-MAX= +002% @ 0500UT NEUTN-MIN= -003% @ 1325UT NEUTN-AVG= -0.2%
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 1825UT PCA-MIN= -0.4DB @ 1000UT PCA-AVG= -0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55430NT @ 0406UT BOUTF-MIN=55403NT @ 1900UT BOUTF-AVG=55415NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+147NT@ 1851UT GOES7-MIN=N:+001NT@ 1308UT G7-AVG=+091,+026,+014
GOES6-MAX=P:+173NT@ 1559UT GOES6-MIN=E:-016NT@ 1848UT G6-AVG=+111,-005,+033
FLUXFCST=STD:130,130,125;SESC:130,130,125 BAI/PAI-FCST=012,010,010/010,010,010
KFCST=3333 2223 2332 2223 27DAY-AP=007,006 27DAY-KP=2312 2221 3111 1222
WARNINGS=
ALERTS=
!!END-DATA!!

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 18:26:57 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!gatech!concert!samba!
usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: DJ-580 soft case
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm considerign the purchase of a DJ-580T as well (Alinco, for those not in the know), and notice the brochure only shows the ESC-17 case, which is presumably for the 7.2V battery or the AA battery case. Since I plan on getting a couple of 12V packs, I'm wondering if a longer case is available? The AES catalog only shows one case for the DJ-580T.

-ks
9 weeks and still waiting.

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: 11 Jan 93 19:10:34 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!logicse!cs.uoregon.edu!
news.uoregon.edu!news.uoregon.edu!systems@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: DJ-580 soft case
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1Py7wB2w165w@tsoft.net> bbs.railroad@tsoft.net (Mike Leland) writes:

> jeffh@ludwig.cc.uoregon.edu (Jeff Hite) writes:

>

> > I'm looking for a soft case for my 580, it's part# ESC-17 and have not
> > been able to find one thru the dealers I usually purchase from. Anyone
> > know of a store that has any or dealers that stock alot of the Alinco
> > accessories?

> > Thanks,

> > Jeff Hite KF7SZ

> > jeffh@ludwig.cc.uoregon.edu

>

>

> Well if you call any of the many HROs I am sure they have them in
> stock... if not try AES or someother place like it.... they cost about
> 20.00.... TTYL!!!

>

>

> MIKE LELAND REDWOOD CITY, ca KD6PIW(Politics in Washington?)

>

> --

> Mike Leland (bbs.railroad@tsoft.net)

I tried HRO and AES and they were on backorder...Lee
(ccrafton@daewoo.math.indiana.edu) pointed me at Radio Center USA which
had them in stock. Thanks to everyone who replied!

Jeff Hite KF7SZ

jeffh@ludwig.cc.uoregon.edu

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 18:51:26 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!mlb.semi.harris.com!
news@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: GRC-14 surplus

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greetings all....

Can anyone email me or post some info on military surplus GRC-14's.

Thanks,
Ray

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 17:20:25 GMT
From: ucse1x!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!
mojo.eng.umd.edu!chuck@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: intermod, overload, desense?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <w456wB1w165w@precipice.chi.il.us> jjw@precipice.chi.il.us (John Welch) writes:

>pas@jupitercmc.ca (Peter Stokes) writes:
> <stuff deleted>
>> I presume that "desense" means the receiver
>> front end noise floor has effectively been raised to such
>> a high level as to bury most other signals.
>
> Desense is when a strong out-of-band signal causes the AGC of

Uhhmm, I haven't seen many FM receivers that have AGC. They generally rely on the high gain IF limiters to clamp things down to size, and to control the gain.

Desense is more of a saturation thing. When a strong enough signal enters the RF preamp stage of a receiver, the preamp goes nonlinear, and starts to saturate. In the saturated condition, the preamp cannot respond to any tiny signals, only the very strong signal. This cuts the effective gain of the receiver for the smaller desired signal.

Note, the AGC description of desense would be a perfectly valid possibility in an FM receiver that had an AGC, and was plagued with a strong signal that fit within the IF passband of the AGC's detector.

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV
chuck@eng.umd.edu

Date: 11 Jan 93 18:49:39 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!olivea!inews.Intel.COM!
sousa.intel.com!jreece@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: License Delays
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <POPOVICH.93Jan10220335@morningside.cs.columbia.edu>, popovich@cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes:

> And as for the FCC getting
> NOTHING, they're a Federal Government agency, so even if we're not
> paying them directly, we're paying them, make no mistake about it!
> -Steve

Even if they did create a license fee there is absolutely no guarantee that it would go towards improving the licensing process. Virtually all federal "user fees" go into one big kitty that Congress can and does misappropriate at will.

--
John Reece "This lifeboat is full"
Not an Intel spokesman

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 15:45:18 GMT
From: shearson.com!jenny!mjohnsto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Need recommendations for packet modems
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I want to get a packet TNC and I can't decide which model is best for me. The recommendations I've gotten thus far run from the Tigertronics/Baycomm setup to the KAM All-Mode unit, which is quite expensive for my current tastes.

Having an all-mode unit might be nice, but I wonder if I'll *really* use all those features in the long run, aside from playing with them. So, in a nutshell, I think I'm looking at a lower-end model. The Tigertronics looks attractive and received a pretty glowing review in December's 73 magazine and this has piqued my interest in the unit. Others have mentioned that it might not be the most flexible unit, so I'm a little wary, though for what they ask for it (<\$80 w/software) I think it might be a good starter.

What do you folks think? Please email me, if possible, and I'll summarize for others interested.

Thanks.

73

--
Michael R. Johnston, System Administrator mjohnsto@shearson.com
"The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man." - G.B. Shaw

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 17:53:45 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
paladin.american.edu!gatech!concert!samba!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Yaesu 5100 reviews??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of
North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information
Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 17:56:33 GMT
From: ucselx!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!emory!gatech!concert!samba!
usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Yaesu FT 5100 Reviews??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone have any good or bad comments about the Yaesu 5100 Dual Band
mobile rig??? I am thinking of getting one, but would like to check with
others who already have one of the units first.

Also - has anyone tried the extended receive mod for the 5100?? I helped a
friend modify his and an interesting thing happens when you are done...the
initial receive range on the VHF side now starts at 20.00 MHz. I don't
imagine the thing could actually receive much down there but would love to
be proven wrong. There's a lot of activity on 42 MHz around here that I
would like to monitor using the 5100. I would love to hear from anyone
about being able to hear or not hear in that range. Thanks - Jeff - KD4JIA

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of
North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information
Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: 11 Jan 1993 18:15:41 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan08.184505.28001@eng.umd.edu>, <C0n3vs.3HC@NeoSoft.com>,
<1993Jan11.170139.26743@eng.umd.edu>
Subject : Re: On private repeaters

In article <1993Jan11.170139.26743@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>The area from 440-442 is set aside for ATV, 442-445 are for FM repeaters,
>and from 445-447 are control links and repeaters, and 447-450 are repeaters,
>leaving 446.0 as the sole and only FM simplex frequency allowed for in the
>ARRL band plan for 3/4 meters!

Looks like 445-447 does just fine, actually...There's nothing wrong with running simplex on a control link frequency, and if 440-442 is set aside for ATV, then the range from 445-447 doesn't do much good for repeaters with a 5 MHz offset. (Yes, I know there's no rule requiring a 5 MHz offset, but smaller ones don't work well with commonly available duplexers, and some radios (most notably MICORs) need 5 MHz if anything at all.)

Remember, further, that the ARRL band plan is only a SUGGESTION! In Texas, we have some significant differences, which we adopted on the belief that the ARRL made some serious screwups in the one they adopted; the most notable is that we use 20 KHz channel spacing on 2 meters across the band.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of All Fears_

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 17:01:39 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!

chuck@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan7.225447.29233@allegra.att.com>,

<1993Jan08.184505.28001@eng.umd.edu>, <C0n3vs.3HC@NeoSoft.com>

Subject : Re: On private repeaters

In article <C0n3vs.3HC@NeoSoft.com> jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:

>In article <1993Jan08.184505.28001@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>>Well, since we've been talking about closed repeaters in general, and their

>>effect on the 440-449MHz section of the 3/4m band in specific; the simplex

>>frequencies for fm voice are: ... 446.00MHz. Oops! Did I say frequencies?

>>I meant frequency. (OBTW, this is according to the ARRL band plan for 3/4m.)

>

>BZZZZZZT! Wrong answer. You're forgetting that the amateur band is

No, I haven't! Read my post!

>420-450 MHz, not 440-450 MHz. I haven't bought a radio in the last 5 years

>which didn't cover the entire 420-450 range with only slight modification.
>There are also many parts of the country which have much larger areas set
>aside for simplex. In Texas, for example, the band plan does
>not use 440-442 or 445-447 for repeaters. Isn't 4 MHz enough simplex
>space?

BZZZZZZT! Wrong answer! Have you checked your ARRL band plan lately? The sections of 3/4m below 440 are set aside for modes like TV, and weak signal work, and EME, OSCAR, and CW, ... If you want to see some hams really get honked off, try running FM in the weak signal, SSB or CW areas!

The area from 440-442 is set aside for ATV, 442-445 are for FM repeaters, and from 445-447 are control links and repeaters, and 447-450 are repeaters, leaving 446.0 as the sole and only FM simplex frequency allowed for in the ARRL band plan for 3/4 meters!

I know that some areas deviate from the plan, but this ARRL plan is the ARRL plan that I mentioned in my earlier posting.

Secondly, ICOM 4ATs only cover 10MHz of the band. It's all I have. I would gladly upgrade if you would give me your commercial version of the 04AT, or maybe your Porche ;-)

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV
chuck@eng.umd.edu

Date: 11 Jan 93 10:18:48 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!ferrari!jwl@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1iidqgINNet9@darkstar.UCSC.EDU>, <1993Jan08.183337.27784@eng.umd.edu>, <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>.c
Reply-To : jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim Lynch)
Subject : Re: Anybody want to talk about Clover?

In article <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow) writes:

>Is there a FAQ or reference list (articles, papers, hardware suppliers)
>for clover? That would be a good start.
>
>Perhaps also a mailing list.
>
>I am interested, as are others in my area. But as far as we can tell, it
>will be a \$1k investment to get started. Is there more than one HW

>implementation?

When I talked to the folks at HAL last month, they indicated they would release clover design details "sometime in the future" Until then, they are going to get whatever they want for it, it appears. Without competition there won't be much downward pressure on the price. If you had purchased one before the first of the year, you could have had it for \$750.

We need a "public domain" system to be distributed to multiple vendors, like TAPR has done. That is probably the only way we will be able to have reasonable prices on advanced communications modes. As long as the modes remain proprietary, they will be expensive. Anyone care to form a committee to design such an advanced mode?

>

>I have heard much whining over 56k costs of \$200-500. Granted that
>Clover is unique, but I would hope that we would be able to get the
>costs down to the "upper end DSP tnc" range. (Please feel free to inform
>me if it there currently)

>

>Thanks in advance!

>

>

> Alan Barrow km4ba | I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack
> jab@atl.hp.com | ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched
> | C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhauser gate.
> ...!gatech!kd4nc! | All those moments will be lost in time -
> km4ba!alan | like tears in rain. Time to die. Roy Batty

--

Jim Lynch, Sales Analyst, Cray Research, Inc. / ARS: K4GV0
Southeast District, Phone: (404) 631-2254, Email: jwl@sedist.cray.com
Suite 270, 200 Westpark Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

Date: 11 Jan 93 10:18:48 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!ferrari!jwl@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <liidqgINNet9@darkstar.UCSC.EDU>, <1993Jan08.183337.27784@eng.umd.edu>, <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>me
Reply-To : jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim Lynch)
Subject : Re: Anybody want to talk about Clover?

In article <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow)

writes:

>Is there a FAQ or reference list (articles, papers, hardware suppliers)
>for clover? That would be a good start.
>
>Perhaps also a mailing list.
>
>I am interested, as are others in my area. But as far as we can tell, it
>will be a \$1k investment to get started. Is there more than one HW
>implementation?

When I talked to the folks at HAL last month, they indicated they would release clover design details "sometime in the future" Until then, they are going to get whatever they want for it, it appears. Without competition there won't be much downward pressure on the price. If you had purchased one before the first of the year, you could have had it for \$750.

We need a "public domain" system to be distributed to multiple vendors, like TAPR has done. That is probably the only way we will be able to have reasonable prices on advanced communications modes. As long as the modes remain proprietary, they will be expensive. Anyone care to form a committee to design such an advanced mode?

>
>I have heard much whining over 56k costs of \$200-500. Granted that
>Clover is unique, but I would hope that we would be able to get the
>costs down to the "upper end DSP tnc" range. (Please feel free to inform
>me if it there currently)
>
>Thanks in advance!
>
>
> Alan Barrow km4ba | I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack
> jab@atl.hp.com | ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched
> | C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhauser gate.
> ..!gatech!kd4nc! | All those moments will be lost in time -
> km4ba!alan | like tears in rain. Time to die. Roy Batty

--

Jim Lynch, Sales Analyst, Cray Research, Inc. / ARS: K4GV0
Southeast District, Phone: (404) 631-2254, Email: jwl@sedist.cray.com
Suite 270, 200 Westpark Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1993 17:54:48 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!stanford.edu!CSD-

NewsHost.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan08.183337.27784@eng.umd.edu>, <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>,
<1993Jan11.101849.25363@walter.cray.com>
Subject : Re: Anybody want to talk about Clover?

In article <1993Jan11.101849.25363@walter.cray.com> jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim Lynch) writes:

>We need a "public domain" system to be distributed to multiple vendors, like
>TAPR has done. That is probably the only way we will be able to have reasonable
>prices on advanced communications modes. As long as the modes remain
>proprietary, they will be expensive. Anyone care to form a committee to design
>such an advanced mode?

Frankly, \$1000 for the HAL CLOVER board is a good deal. The amount of DSP hardware on the board is impressive to say the least. The CLOVER software is, however, untrivial. Aside from all of the adaptive filters and modems, CLOVER makes extensive use of fast spectral Reed - Solomon coding systems, which are not much fun to write, I'm afraid. Even when HAL does formally release a protocol spec, don't count on cheap knockoffs anytime soon.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #48
